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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This thesis applies Schenkerian analytical techniques to *Trois chorals pour orgue* No. 3 by César Franck (1822-1890). Franck's third organ chorale is the last piece the composer wrote, composed in 1890, and it is the pinnacle of his compositional style. Very little scholarly work has been written about the piece, and the various analyses available differ greatly regarding its formal structure. Because Franck's music features linear, chromatic harmonies, a linear analytical method such as Schenkerian analysis is an appropriate choice. By examining the piece with a Schenkerian approach, I hope to highlight the unique characteristics of the piece as well as clarify the formal structure of the work.

César Franck

César Franck was born on December 10, 1822, in Liège, Belgium. He began studying music at the age of eight. By 1834 his family had relocated to Paris so Franck could enroll at the Paris Conservatory, where he studied piano with Pierre Zimmermann, counterpoint with Simon Leborne, and organ with François Benoist. Franck spent most of his life working as a church organist, composing, and teaching; he was appointed as professor of organ at the Paris Conservatory in 1872. Franck was very influential as a teacher, and among his students were Ernest Chausson, Henri Duparc, Louis Ganne, Augusta Holmès, Vincent D'Indy, Guillaume Lekeu, Charles Tournemire, and Louis Vierne. In 1890, while Franck was on his way to a rehearsal, he was involved in a cab accident with a horse-drawn omnibus. He recovered from the accident, but five months
later he developed pneumonia and died on November 8, 1890. It is not known whether Franck’s cab accident and pneumonia were related.

**Trois Chorals Pour Orgue No. 3 in A minor**

Franck's *Trois choral pour orgue* were written in 1890 and were the last pieces he completed before his death. “‘Before I die,' Franck had been heard to murmur, 'I am going to write some organ chorales, just as Bach did, but with quite a different plan.’”¹ Franck first performed the work in his home for several of his students. Tournemire wrote that “we cannot forget the emotion we experienced the day we heard these magnificent works played by the maître on the piano in his home. Our job was to play the pedal part ‘à la main.’ A rather banal premiere!”² Franck returned to Paris before he died to play through the chorales on his organ in order to add notation for the necessary stops.

When the work was first published by Durand in 1892, each of the three chorales had a dedication. The third chorale was dedicated to Augusta Holmès, one of Franck's students. However, D'Indy writes that the third chorale was supposed to be dedicated to organist Eugène Gigout.³ It continues to be unclear to whom Franck really intended the chorales to be dedicated, if anyone.

The third chorale in the work, in A minor, is described by Davies as “an unpretentious study in the principles of melodic progression.”⁴ The opening “Quasi allegro” begins with sixteenth-note arpeggiated figures that move chromatically through various tonal centers. Interspersed between sections with sixteenth notes are

---

1 Laurence Davies, *César Franck and His Circle* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1970), 244.
4 Davies, 244.
“Largamente” sections, which break up the texture and slow the harmonic rhythm. It is not until m. 31 that the chorale theme is stated. All three of these musical ideas are restated and developed until m. 97, where the second part of the work, “Adagio,” begins. This section introduces and develops new themes throughout the section. The adagio ends in m. 147 with the return of the allegro tempo (“Le double plus vite”) and the sixteenth-note figures. Fragments of the chorale theme appear along with the sixteenth notes until m. 179, when the full chorale theme is stated for the last time. The work ends with a coda using tonic prolongation.

There are two significant existing theoretically oriented analyses of Franck’s Trois chorals pour orgue No. 3. The first is a dissertation by Martin John Yribarren, which uses a combination of Schenkerian analysis and Schoenberg's analytic concepts. The second is a dissertation by Brian Craig Dusell, which uses a more traditional analytical approach. Both authors discuss the form of the work; Yribarren describes the form as “ternary....However, many passages fulfill roles commonly found in sonata-allegro form.” Dusell describes the form only as a “three-part formal plan.”

Other writers who discuss the work vary widely in their description of the form. Demuth refers to it as “variations on a theme,” D'Indy further elaborates by calling it “great variation form,” Grace states that it is reminiscent of Beethoven and is a “large

7 Yribarren, 430.
8 Dusell, 149.
9 Norman Demuth, César Franck (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949), 112.
10 D'Indy, 201.
variation form,”¹¹ Smith calls it a toccata,¹² Vallas classifies it as “a kind of sonata with two allegros surrounding an adagio,”¹³ and Ochse¹⁴ gives no clear description of its form at all.

A Schenkerian Approach

Heinrich Schenker was born in the western region of Ukraine in 1868. After studying at the Vienna Conservatory, he pursued a career as a pianist, conductor, editor, and composer. Schenker had very strong opinions in regard to contemporary writings in music theory and pedagogy, and he began publishing his own writings on the subject in 1906. His theories developed into an analytical system of tonal music that “provides a comprehensive view of a work in all dimensions from the small to the large.”¹⁵ The culmination of his life's work is Free Composition (Der freie Satz), which was published posthumously in 1935.¹⁶

Schenker's analytic approach is specifically intended for tonal music in a defined common-practice time period, as described by Tom Pankhurst:

Schenker focuses on the music of a fairly small number of Baroque, Classical and Romantic composers, from Bach through Beethoven to Brahms. His approach to this repertoire is encapsulated in a motto inscribed at the beginning of several of his most influential works: Semper idem sed non eodem modo (always the same but not in the same way).¹⁷

---

¹² Rollin Smith, Playing the Organ Works of César Franck (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1997), 249.
Brahms's death in 1897, with his last work dated the previous year, places Franck's chorale just within the time period for traditional Schenkerian analysis. While the stylistic boundaries of Brahms's late works are generally considered suitable for Schenkerian analysis, Franck's progressive compositions are outside the traditional Schenkerian "canon." Because of this progressivism, it is necessary to take some liberties while applying this analytic technique. However, this analysis is still a suitable medium to show the work from a new perspective.

By using a Schenkerian analytical approach, I hope to gain a new perspective on Franck's compositional process. Schenkerian analysis is more linear in nature than traditional harmonic analysis, and it can emphasize the impact of form on a work and help clarify the formal layout. Pankhurst states, "instead of breaking a piece down into static parts that make up a whole, he [Schenker] describes music as a dynamic process of tonal tension and resolution."\(^{18}\) I hope to come to a conclusion that defines an accurate formal plan of the work by concentrating on the piece as a whole.

\(^{18}\) Pankhurst, 129.
CHAPTER II
A SCHENKERIAN PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Schenkerian analysis reveals many contrapuntal layers within Franck's third organ chorale, the most important being the dominance of “five.” The most important element of a Schenkerian analysis is the *Ursatz*, or fundamental structure. The *Ursatz* is the combination of the lower voice (*Bassbrechung*), which is the bass arpeggiation through the fifth, and the upper voice (*Urlinie*), which is the descending fundamental line. The *Urlinie* may descend from 8, 5, or 3. This work features a 5-line *Urlinie*, multiple *Ursatz* parallelisms emphasizing 5-line structure, and linear progressions of a fifth, often in an upper voice. Each of these building blocks forms a foundation for the work's *Ursatz*.

**The Case for a 5-Line**

The smallest of these building blocks are the numerous linear progressions found throughout the analysis. The opening immediately presents a chromatic fifth-progression descent at the foreground level. From mm. 32-35, the descending fifth-progression could almost be called an “*Urlinie* parallelism,” in the sense that it mimics the descent of the *Urlinie* in the highest voice, but it has no matching support underneath it. This type of fifth-progression descent also appears from mm. 58-61. It is interesting to note that both of these important fifth-progressions are diatonic with no passing chromaticism and occur at the level of tonic (mm. 32-35) and at the level of dominant (mm. 58-61).

Progressions of all sizes in the first section (before the adagio) descend except for one. The only ascending linear progression occurs after m. 90 in the lowest voice. The
reason for its ascent is to connect the *Bassbrechung* in its own ascent from tonic to dominant, therefore making this a fifth-progression. There is a mixture of ascending and descending progressions in the second section. The only prominent fifth-progression in the second section appears in mm. 117-119 in the tonic key and has a $\#3$ due to the change of mode in this section. The next statement does not appear again until the chorale theme returns in m. 140. Once again, this progression is at the important pitch level of the dominant, is diatonic, and occurs in the highest voice.

The third section of the piece (beginning in m. 147) has numerous fifth-progressions occurring in multiple voices and at varying levels of importance. From mm. 160-177, three fifth-progressions occur in the highest voice. The first begins on D♯ (and descends with $b2$), the second descends from D♯ (also using $b2$), and the third ascends to the level of tonic to begin on E. At the same time, the lowest voice contains a fully chromatic ascending fifth-progression from tonic to dominant. The increased frequency of fifth-progressions during the third section prepares the final descent of the *Urlinie*.

As an outgrowth of linear progressions at a higher level, *Ursatz* parallelisms occur at important structural points in the work. The first, which appears in m. 44, has some striking differences from the *Ursatz*. It is at the level of dominant, and the second scale-degree is $b2$ supported by a Neapolitan. This parallelism occurs at the end of the first full statement of the chorale theme. The second parallelism appears in m. 74 and is very similar to the *Ursatz*; the only difference is the support of the $6$ for $4$, which is in a different inversion.\(^1\) This statement signals the end of the last chorale statement before the

\(^1\) $6$ for $4$ is a substitution for the normal $5$-line pattern in the *Urlinie* and will be discussed in greater detail later in the chapter.
Adagio section.

The last parallelism appears in m. 187 and, like the first parallelism, has several differences from the original Ursatz. The 6 for 4 support is also different here; this time a VII°₇ chord is used instead of a VI chord. In addition to this change, the support of 3 is a VI chord instead of a secondary function. The Neapolitan also appears again with b2. The parallelisms foreshadow the ultimate outcome of the Ursatz but are altered enough to keep the final descent of the Urlinie from being too predictable.

The Quest for the Ursatz

I began my search for the Ursatz at the end of the piece, where the Urlinie makes its final descent. There is a clear progression from 3 to 2 to 1, yet the beginning of the work has no clear support for 3. On the contrary, the pitch E (5) holds a significant position from the beginning; it is the highest pitch in the opening arpeggiation and the starting pitch of the main chorale theme. When looking at the final descent of the Urlinie, there is a clear 5, but the 4 is missing. The only structural point in the Urlinie that occurs between 5 and 3 is 6, so my analysis incorporates a “6 for 4” substitution, a substitution that is “quite common.”² The pattern of 5-6 for 4-3-2-1 is an integral part of the main theme and can also be seen in all the Ursatz parallelisms.

The technique of “6 for 4” is sometimes used in a 5-line Urlinie where the sixth scale-degree is substituted for the fourth scale-degree. Scale-degree six is usually supported by IV or II°, and can either be followed by 4 or proceed straight to 3.³ In this instance, the 6 for 4 proceeds straight to 3 but is not supported by either IV or II°; instead,

³ David Gagné, e-mail message to author, May 1, 2010.
a chromatic VI with a lowered fifth is used in m. 190. This allows the Bassbrechung to remain as a tonic prolongation, as seen in Schenker's explanation of the 5-line fundamental structure.4

Another way to interpret the support of the 6 for 4 is to analyze the VI chord as a secondary dominant of the Neapolitan. The 6 for 4 is restated in the Urlinie in m. 191, and this time it is supported by the resolution of the secondary function: a minor Neapolitan with an added 6 in the bass (which continues the chromatic descent to F#).5

**The Phrygian Influence**

The chorale theme itself has many instances of modal inflection. The most important of these is Franck's use of the Neapolitan to suggest the Phrygian mode. Dussell describes this decision as “exploit[ing] the chromatic inflection of the second scale degree and the duality between 2-1 (B-A) and b2-1 (B♭-A), which has a potentially greater impact on the sound...”6 Two of the Ursatz parallelisms feature a b2 supported by bII6, and two of the Urlinie parallelisms also feature the use of a b2. The simple use of the Neapolitan is not what makes this progression interesting, however; it is the resolution of the Neapolitan straight to tonic that creates a plagal ending to the phrases.

The use of the Neapolitan resolving to tonic is evident in other works as well. The conclusion of the second movement of Brahms's Symphony No. 4 features a Neapolitan (with a tonic pedal) immediately resolving to the E major tonic, as seen in Figure 1. The

---


5 The case for a minor Neapolitan will be discussed shortly. Alternatively, this chord could also be analyzed as a G half-diminished seventh chord.

conclusion of Strauss's *Also Sprach Zarathustra* also juxtaposes the Neapolitan and tonic, but this ending is a little more ambiguous.

Figure 1. Movement of Neapolitan to Tonic in Brahms's Symphony No. 4, Op. 98, mvt. II
In Franck's chorale, movement of $b\text{II}^6$-I creates a bass motion of $4-\hat{1}$ and creates a plagal cadence at the ends of phrases. This is particularly important to the overall structure of Franck's organ chorale. Unlike Figure 1, where the bass motion is obscured by a tonic pedal, Franck uses $b\text{II}$ in first inversion resolving to I to create a bass arpeggiation of $4-\hat{1}$. The only two Ursatz descents (parallelisms and the final descent) that have authentic cadences are the parallelism in mm. 74-78 (the last full statement of the chorale theme before the Adagio) and the final descent in mm. 190-194, both of which are moments of structural importance to the piece. All of the other Ursatz parallelism descents replace $\hat{2}$ with $b\hat{2}$ and include the $b\text{II}^6$ (with its predominant function), thus creating plagal cadences instead of authentic cadences.

The end of the coda also uses a plagal cadence in a reflexive way to look back on the piece as a whole. There is an implied $b\text{II}^6$ in m. 198 with the B$b$, which becomes a II$^7$ that proceeds to tonic (with a Picardy third). The return of the Neapolitan in the coda solidifies its significance to the rest of the work.

In regard to the support of the $6$ for $\hat{4}$ in the final descent of the Ursatz, the second interpretation, which includes a secondary dominant of $b\text{II}$ resolving to a minor Neapolitan, seems unorthodox at first. However, after seeing the role of the Neapolitan in the rest of the work, it is a logical possibility. The use of a minor Neapolitan is unusual, but not unprecedented. Lester writes that “if the third of a Neapolitan triad is lowered, making the quality of the triad minor, scale step 4 is lowered so far that it becomes equivalent to scale step 3.”

However, Jackson describes the use of the minor Neapolitan

---

as “yet another means for creating new chord forms in the nineteenth century” and cites an example in m. 205 of the fourth movement of Beethoven's Symphony No. 9. “In the fourth movement an $E_b$ minor chord resolves to an A major dominant chord (preceded by its own dominant) just prior to the boisterous restatement of the opening $d$ minor theme.”

Jackson's interpretation observes the relationship between the $E_b$-minor chord and the home key, but this example can be viewed a different way. Schenker's analysis of the same work offers a different opinion; he analyzes the $E_b$ as an enharmonic respelling of $D\#$, which focuses on the relationship between the $E_b$-minor chord and A major, the home key's dominant.

Another earlier example from Beethoven (dated 1798) shows a clearer example of $bII_b$, in the second movement of his Piano Sonata No. 7, Op. 10, No. 3. Beginning in m. 65, the texture dramatically changes and features a progression using the minor Neapolitan as a predominant chord, as analyzed by Wintle. As seen in Figure 2, a major Neapolitan is achieved in m. 68, but only as a passing sonority between diminished-seventh chords.

---

9 Ibid.
An even clearer example of a minor Neapolitan can be seen in Schubert's String Quartet No. 14 (*Death and the Maiden*), m. 328, as seen in Figure 3. In Kessler's analysis of this work, she writes, “This is a journey outside the normal tonal realm to reach the
nether world of altered Phrygian $b\Pi_b$, a harmony that provides the semitonal upper neighbors for all three of the tonic's triadic members. It is thus the most extreme expression of the semitonal motive associated with grief and death.”

To Interrupt or Not to Interrupt

The occurrence of an interruption (or lack thereof) is a defining element in regards to formal implication in Schenkerian analysis. However, whether or not a piece contains an interruption is not always clear. In the case of Franck's chorale a bit of ambiguity arises in m. 97, the beginning of the adagio section.

In one sense it is easy to see an interruption occurring in m. 105. While the final descent of the Ursatz has a $\hat{6}$ for $\hat{4}$ substitution in the Urlinie, $\hat{4}$ is actually present and used for the break instead of $\hat{2}$. Scale-degree $\hat{4}$ is supported by $V^7$ in m. 96 and the D is prolonged through m. 105, where it is again supported with $V^7$. There is a brief ascent to $\hat{5}$ after the interruption supported with tonic. However, m. 97 marks the beginning of the adagio section.

---

middle section of the piece: the adagio, and along with it, a change of mode to A major. The tonic harmony supporting the return of 5 in m. 106 is A minor, which gives this return a strong foundation in the home key.

An interruption at this instance yields a 5-4 || 5-1 structure, which is not supported in Schenker's writings in *Free Composition*. He states, “In the possibility of the structural subdivision 5-2 lies the root of the interruption-form 5-2 || 5-1...”\(^\text{13}\) However, in Samarotto's discussion of “free interruption,” he states,

The notion that linear progression may be interrupted and return to its beginning to make a complete presentation corresponds well with period construction; indeed, Schenker describes this sort of interruption in these situations before he explicitly invokes the term. Since these phrases typically begin on the tonic, the linear progressions involved will typically depart from 3 or 5. The first branch of the interruption can stop at its most “dissonant” point if it is temporarily stabilized by a dividing dominant (Teiler).\(^\text{14}\)

One example from Schenker's own work is his analysis of Beethoven's Symphony No. 3 found in *The Masterwork in Music*.\(^\text{15}\) In it, he shows a fifth-progression that is divided by 5-4 || 5-4 || 3-2 || 3-2 || 1. These writings support the idea that a 5-4 || 5-1 interruption is possible.

Analyzing Franck's chorale with an interruption is not without its drawbacks, however. The irregular break of 5-4 || 5-1, while justified above, is not an orthodox practice in Schenkerian analysis. Part of this problem is due to the prolongation of 4, which is the seventh of the V\(^7\), and therefore a dissonance. By interrupting at the

dissonance, there is no possibility for resolution of the seventh. There is also no place for 4 in the *Ursatz* due to the 6 for 4 substitution.

After reviewing all the evidence above, I have decided to analyze the work without an interruption. Instead of the V7 providing the support for an interruption, it is merely a dividing dominant with the prolonged D resolving to an inner voice. The overall prolongation of V7 connects 5 into the Adagio, and the *Ursatz* remains consistent with the 6 for 4 substitution throughout. Without an interruption, the chorale is an undivided form.

**Duality of Register in the *Ursatz***

The use of register in the work is also unusual. Traditionally, the register of the final descent would be analyzed as the obligatory register in this piece. However, this obligatory register is not used or established until mm. 118-120, which is over halfway through the piece. Another register is used consistently before m. 118 that does not exactly disappear afterward. This register does in fact appear during the final descent of the *Ursatz* in octaves with the “obligatory” register. Because of the importance of both registers, it is possible to analyze the work with dual “obligatory” registers in levels: principal and subsidiary registers.

Because E6 is the highest voice and the established octave in use from m. 118 to the end, it would be considered the principal register, while the E5 register would be considered the subsidiary register. By joining the registers in written octaves, as opposed to assumed octaves using organ stops, their duality brings unity to the work, just as a single obligatory register would in a more traditional piece.

The use of dual octaves was not an arbitrary decision for Franck. Just as he
foreshadows the final descent of the *Ursatz* on different levels (*Ursatz* parallelisms and *Urlinie* parallelisms), he also uses foreshadowing to prepare for shifts of register. A prime example of this foreshadowing occurs between mm. 26-35 in the *Urlinie*. The secondary register (E5) is being used and a shift of register occurs in m. 30 to E4. The next time E4 is stated (in m. 32), an E5 is also assumed as part of an *Urlinie* parallelism. This assumed pitch becomes a reality in m. 35 with a shift of register back to E5. Shift of register can be seen more in depth with the middleground graph in Appendix B. The use of the dual registers will also impact the form of the structure because of their duality, which will be discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER III
A DIFFERENT INTERPRETATION

A \textit{5}-Line Versus a \textit{3}-Line

In Yribarren's analysis of this piece, he also begins by noting the inconsistent formal labels given to Franck's chorale, further stating, “...the work exhibits characteristics of each of these forms and consists of a succession of passages (with contrasting textures, timbres, and tonal motions) that...leads to a climactic close.”\footnote{Martin John Yribarren, “Melodic and Tonal Coherence in the Organ Works of César Franck: An Approach Employing Basic Shape and Structural Levels” (PhD diss., University of Southern California, 1994), 430.} He then assigns a three-part formal plan to the work and outlines its structure. Schenkerian analysis is used specifically to analyze the contrapuntal structure of the work.

Yribarren's analysis has some distinct differences in comparison to my analysis, with the largest difference being at the background level. He chose a \textit{3}-line \textit{Urlinie}, with the \textit{3} becoming \#3 during the Adagio. The analysis is also sectionalized to match the three-part formal plan outlined earlier, which is based on motivic and thematic material. He begins by discussing the work's tonality being established with a i-iv-V-i harmonic progression from mm. 1-30. However, his middleground graph shows the \textit{Bassbrechung} beginning in m. 1 and connecting to the \textit{Urlinie} in m. 39. This long stretch is unorthodox, and without a foreground, it is difficult to see (and hear) the justification for it.

Emphasis is instead placed on the bass arpeggiation throughout the middleground and its relationship to the motivic material in the work. While the \textit{Urlinie} descends by a third, the bass outlines i-iii-V, which is directly related to the figuration in the opening motive. To juxtapose the previous bass arpeggiation, there is also a plagal progression of
I-vi-IV-I appearing during the Adagio. This plagal progression “mirrors the i-III-V-i progressions contained in the larger spans of the work.”

The analysis concludes with a “climactic recapitulation of Theme 2, the chorale...” The final descent of the Ursatz occurs from mm. 182-194. Yribarren discusses the third phrase of the chorale being “altered to cadence in the tonic (measure 89), thereby producing a i-iii-i-V-i harmonic outline for the entire theme.” Also mentioned is the coda, with its concluding plagal cadence and the plagal progression being a mirror progression of i-III-V. The final third-ascent of the upper voice during the coda is interpreted as the reverse of the structural descent of the Urline.

**Formal Conclusions from a 3-Line**

Yribarren's analysis primarily focuses on a melodic interpretation of the work, with Schenkerian analysis being used to find supporting counterpoint to the three-part formal plan. The middleground graph shows an undivided form to the work, the formal implications of the analysis are questionable. The three-part form was assigned to the work before the Schenkerian analysis was conceived, as evidenced in the sectional approach to the piece.

Schenker's theory with regard to form is not a fully developed theory, but the central ideas were put into place in *Free Composition*. He states,

> Coherence in language does not arise from a single syllable, a single word, or even from a single sentence; despite the correspondence of words and things, every coherent relationship in language depends upon a meaning hidden in a background. Such meaning achieves no fulfillment with mere beginnings. Similarly, music finds no coherence in a “motive” in the usual sense. Thus, I

---

2 Yribarren, 443.
4 Ibid.
reject those definitions of song form which take the motive as their starting point and emphasize manipulation of the motive by means of repetition, variation, extension, fragmentation, or dissolution.\(^5\)

The main flaw of Yribarren's analysis as a Schenkerian interpretation is the dependence on thematic elements to dictate the final outcome. The differences between his 3-line and my 5-line are therefore moot.

---

CHAPTER IV

FURTHER FORMAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCLUSION

An Undivided Form

After analyzing Franck’s chorale from a Schenkerian perspective, the form of the work becomes clear. My application of Schenkerian analysis shows an undivided, or one-part form, which contrasts to previous writings. Cadwallader and Gagné further explain that “a one-part form may be thought of in structural terms as a single cadential progression that serves as the basis for a complete work.”¹

Implications of a Two-Part Form

There are still other possible interpretations of the form. As with Schenker’s structural levels, Cadwallader suggests “the notion of design at different levels” and “that each structural level carries with it its own form and design.”² Three elements of my analysis point toward the possibility of a two-part form: the use of the Neapolitan, the employment of dual registers, and the possibility of a free interruption.

The use of the Neapolitan to create plagal cadences can separate the work into two parts. Including Ursatz parallelisms and the final descent of the Ursatz, there are four total descents. Only two of these descents have authentic cadences: the last descent before the Adagio section beginning in m. 74 and the final descent of the Ursatz beginning in m. 187. The other two Ursatz parallelisms have been “weakened” by the substitution of b₂ for 2 and bII for V. Thus, the form can be divided at a lower level based

on the cadential structure of Ursatz descents.\textsuperscript{3}

Another aspect of my analysis that hints at a two-part form is the use of dual registers. Because the appearance of the principal register is not seen until m. 118 (as an assumed pitch of an Urlinie parallelism) and is later established in m. 120, the subsidiary register has full domain in the preceding measures. This creates a divide in the work between the opening measures and the Adagio section. The unique use of the dual registers could also be interpreted to support an assumption of a three-part form, with the first section belonging to the subsidiary register, the second section belonging to the principal register, and the third section (beginning in m. 175) belonging to both registers.

The possibility of a $5\,4 \parallel 5\,1$ interruption, which occurs in m. 105, would be the strongest evidence toward a two-part form. Although I have not analyzed the work with the interruption, the interpretation that an interruption exists is possible. Perhaps on a different “formal level” such an interruption could exist within a one-part form. “...Because an interruption creates form in ways more easily described than those of an undivided structure, the first stage of a hierarchical theory of form can proceed from the study of the implications – at all levels – of the interruption of a fundamental structure.”\textsuperscript{4}

All of these elements not only point toward a two-part form, but a two-part form centered around the Adagio section of the work. At a middleground level, the cadential implications, the dual registers, and the interruption all occur at the beginning of the adagio section, which is even more separated from the rest of the work by the change of mode. I find it no coincidence that all of these ramifications work together to give the

\textsuperscript{3} A mirroring of the Ursatz descents can be seen in the Urlinie descents with the use of tonic and dominant statements. Only Urlinie parallelisms not at the level of tonic or dominant are de-emphasized with the use of $\frac{3}{2}$.

\textsuperscript{4} Cadwallader, 16.
work the quality of a two-part form at a lower formal level.

Conclusion

The evolutionary development of form was described by Schenker in *Free Composition*: “Although the art of prolongation and diminution ultimately expanded and enriched the form, it was the force of the first passing tone, the first neighboring note, the power of the first structural division which bound form to take on organic unity...”\(^5\) Just as a three-part form is said to be derived from a two-part form,\(^6\) the same can be said of a two-part form being derived from a one-part form. As Cadwallader describes, “at any given [emphasis original] level Schenker's criteria explain the evolution of basic formal patterns, but he does not describe precisely how formal processes not directly linked to the unity or divisibility of the fundamental line are transformed from level to level.”\(^7\)

From a standard formal analytic standpoint, Franck's chorale does not fit any one of the prescribed forms, as shown in Chapter I. From a Schenkerian standpoint, Franck's chorale also does not fit any one formal label. An undivided form is the most appropriate choice for the work from either view, but it does not communicate the complexities of form within the piece. This work exhibits a failure of formal labels on both the traditional and Schenkerian analytic views; only an in-depth analysis reveals the true meaning behind the work.

\(^5\) Schenker, *Free Composition*, 128.
\(^6\) “Division plays the most important role in three-part form also, even though at the first level it brings binary characteristics to the fore, as a consequence of 3-2 || 3-2-1 or 5-2 || 5-1.” Ibid., 132.
\(^7\) Cadwallader, 4.
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CONSTRUCTING SCHENKERIAN GRAPHS IN SIBELIUS

Engraving a Schenkerian graph using music notation software is a daunting project. There is no support for Schenkerian graphs in any available software; a music engraver has to find ways to force the software to create the correct layout and symbols to be put together to make a complete graph. As part of the process of creating this thesis, I had to find creative ways to realize my graphs digitally.

As a music engraver, my preference of notation software is with Avid's Sibelius (currently on version 6). Before starting, I found an excellent guide on Tom Pankhurst's website for presenting Schenker graphs using Sibelius 5. Using this guide, I was able to create a new instrument based on the existing piano instrument that automatically eliminated bar lines, rhythms, and bar rests. However, these items are not permanently removed; they still exist in the document as hidden items.

The next step was to adjust my document with the correct page layout settings. I first adjusted the page orientation to landscape and entered the correct margins for my document. The staff size was enlarged to accommodate the visual requirements of the graphs, and the staff margins were adjusted to allow extra space between the tops of the staves and the margin borders. In the engraving rules menu, bar numbers were eliminated, and in the create menu, page numbers were eliminated. The final graph would later be exported as high-resolution graphics and inserted into my final document.

After setting up the document, noteheads needed to be input. For most of the

---

graphs, I used a music keyboard to input the pitches. For closed noteheads, quarter note values were used and for open noteheads, half notes were used. Because bar lines were still present, notehead placement had to be adjusted using hidden rests to maneuver around the hidden bar lines. For example, if an open notehead was needed, but it occurred on the last beat of an “invisible” measure, the software would split the half note into two invisibly tied quarter notes. I avoided this situation by placing a hidden rest on the last beat of the measure and placing the half note at the beginning of the next measure. In addition to working around bar lines, the pitches needed to line up vertically between the staves. Hidden rests were used in the same way to create space between notes and chords as necessary.

After all the noteheads were input, the next step was to go through the entire graph and check all the accidentals. This task was quite a bit more challenging in the foreground and detailed middleground than the other graphs. Chromatic pitches always appear with the required accidental, and these accidentals must be canceled, even across large stretches of the graph. If parentheses were needed around a notehead, the bracket notehead input option was selected. However, if the notehead was part of a chord that contained multiple accidentals, the automatic bracket notehead option would leave space around the notehead for all accidentals present in the chord. In these cases, plain text parentheses had to be used and spaced carefully around the notehead.

Once all the pitches were present, I began adding measure numbers, beams, stems, and large text. Boxed text was the best solution for measure numbers, and they were positioned at the same height from the staff for uniformity. *Urlinie* beams were made
from the beam option in the line menu. Secondary beams and stems were made from the line option in the line menu. *Urlinie* scale degree numbers were created using an excellent scale-degree font available through Matthew Hindson's website.\(^3\) Roman numerals were created with the specific input in Sibelius but some roman numerals required resized figured bass text when the specific roman numeral inversion symbols were not available. Other large text items, like linear intervallic patterns, were created using plain text entry.

Next, I added slurs, octave lines, small text, and other symbols. When inputting slurs, it is important not to attach the slur directly to a notehead. Slurs must be input without a notehead selected and then be manually positioned over the notes because flexibility is required to avoid collisions with accidentals and other noteheads. The latest version of Sibelius includes additional flexibility by allowing users to adjust slur shape along six different selection points. This feature also allows for creating more elaborate slurs, like the hooked slur from predominant to dominant. Also, to help with keeping the slurs clear, the thickness can be changed in the engraving rules. Dotted slurs are available from the line menu.

Octave lines are created from the line option in the line menu (the same as stems and secondary beams). When octave lines intersect too many items (noteheads, accidentals, etc.), it becomes necessary to split them up by having two separate lines. From the original intersecting line, two other lines are created on top of it so they have the same angle, then the original is deleted. Figured bass was added using the specific

text input available in Sibelius and resized as needed. Nonharmonic tone text and progression text were added as small text or tiny text and positioned accordingly.

Other various symbols were also added at this time. A bracket above or bracket below in the line menu was used for motive brackets. Secondary function arrows with roman numerals were created using an arrowhead from the symbols menu and drawing a slur to create the curved line. Because the slur thickness was already adjusted to be thinner, a slur was possible to use in this instance. Before key signature changes, double bar lines had to be drawn using the line option from the line menu and positioned manually.

While there is no specific program for engraving Schenkerian graphs, there are resources and ways to adapt available tools to meet the needs of such a task. Many of these resources are conveniently available online. However, until better native support is implemented in the available software, Schenkerian graphs will pose a challenge to any engraver.
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